



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MC
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/287,248	04/07/1999	JOHN T. MCDEVITT	5119-00501	6075
7590	02/24/2004		EXAMINER	
ERIC B MEYERTONS CONLEY ROSE & TAYON P O BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 787670398			PADMANABHAN, KARTIC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/287,248	MCDEVITT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kartic Padmanabhan	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36,39,173 and 174 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-36,39,173 and 174 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimers filed on 11/21/03 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US Pat. 6,589,779 or any patents granted on Application Numbers 09/775,048, 09/775,340, 09/775,342, and 10/072,800 have been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimers have been recorded.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-36, 39, and 173-174 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,702. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims recite a system comprising a light source and sensor array, the sensor array comprising a supporting member with multiple cavities and a top cover layer which is coupled to the top of the supporting member such that particle is contained within the cavity. The system also comprises particles and a detector, wherein the detector detects the signal produced by the interaction of the analyte with the particle. According to both sets of claims, light passes from the light source to the particle, and then onto the detector.

4. Claims 1-36, 39 and 173-174 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,206. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims recite a system comprising a light source and sensor array, the sensor array comprising a supporting member with multiple cavities and a top cover layer which is coupled to the top of the supporting member such that particle is contained within the cavity. The system also comprises particles and a detector, wherein the detector detects the signal produced by the interaction of the analyte with the particle. According to both sets of claims, light passes from the light source to the particle, and then onto the detector.

5. Claims 1-36, 39, and 173-174 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of copending Application No. 10/427,744. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims recite a system

comprising a light source and sensor array, the sensor array comprising a supporting member with multiple cavities and a top cover layer which is coupled to the top of the supporting member such that particle is contained within the cavity. The system also comprises particles and a detector, wherein the detector detects the signal produced by the interaction of the analyte with the particle. According to both sets of claims, light passes from the light source to the particle, and then onto the detector.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36, 39, and 173-174 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is noted, however, that the double patenting rejection over US Pat. 6,602,702 from the previous office action remains in this action, as applicant has not filed a terminal disclaimer over this patent nor even addressed this rejection in the response.

Conclusion

Claims 1-36, 39, and 173-174 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kartic Padmanabhan whose telephone number is 571-272-0825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kartic Padmanabhan
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641



LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

02/06/04